```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
                      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 2
               HONORABLE LARRY ALAN BURNS, JUDGE PRESIDING
 3
 4
      UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 5
                                            CASE NO. 07CR00329-LAB
                    PLAINTIFF,
 6
              VS.
                                            SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA
 7
      KYLE DUSTIN FOGGO, (1)
                                            FEBRUARY 14, 2007
                                            9:30 A.M.
      BRENT ROGER WILKES, (2)
 8
                    DEFENDANTS.
 9
10
                           REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT
11
                           INITIAL APPEARANCE
12
                           BOND HEARING
                           ATTORNEY APPOINTMENT HEARING
13
                           ARRAIGNMENT
14
      APPEARANCES:
15
      FOR THE GOVERNMENT:
                                     CAROL C. LAM, U.S. ATTORNEY
                                     BY: SANJAY BHANDARI, ESQ.
16
                                          PHILLIP L.B. HALPERN, ESQ.
                                          JASON A. FORGE, ESQ.
                                     ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEYS
17
                                     880 FRONT STREET
                                     SAN DIEGO, CA. 92101
18
19
                                     AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD
      FOR DEFENDANT (1):
                                     BY: MARK J. MACDOUGALL, ESQ.
20
                                          ANDREW J. DOBER, ESQ.
                                     1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., N.W.
                                     WASHINGTON, DC 20036-1564
21
22
     FOR DEFENDANT (2):
                                     GERAGOS & GERAGOS
                                     BY: MARK J. GERAGOS, ESQ.
23
                                          GEORGE W. BUEHLER, ESO.
                                     350 SOUTH GRAND AVENUE, 39TH FL.
2.4
                                     LOS ANGELES, CA. 90071
25
```

		<b>5</b>	
			2
1	CONTINUED APPEARANCES:		
2	COURT REPORTER:	EVA OEMICK	
3		OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE	
4		940 FRONT STREET, STE. 2190 SAN DIEGO, CA. 92101	
5		TEL: (619) 615-3103	
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18 19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

	4
1	COUNSEL, HAVE YOU RECEIVED A COPY AND DO YOU WAIVE
2	READING?
3	MR. MAC DOUGALL: YES.
4	MR. GERAGOS: YES.
5	THE COURT: YOU ARE FURTHER INFORMED THAT YOU HAVE
6	THE RIGHT TO BE REPRESENTED BY COUNSEL AT ALL STAGES OF THE
7	PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE COURT. YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO REMAIN
8	SILENT. YOU'RE ENTITLED TO TRIAL BY JURY. YOU HAVE A RIGHT
9	TO CONFRONT WITNESSES WHO TESTIFY.
10	HOW DO YOU EACH PLEAD TO THE INDICTMENT?
11	THE COURT: FIRST AS TO MR. FOGGO.
12	DEFENDANT FOGGO: NOT GUILTY, YOUR HONOR.
13	THE COURT: AND MR. WILKES?
14	DEFENDANT WILKES: NOT GUILTY, YOUR HONOR.
15	THE COURT: THE ORDER IS THAT A NOT GUILTY PLEAS ARE
16	TO BE ENTERED ON BEHALF OF BOTH DEFENDANTS.
17	LET ME INQUIRE, MR. MAC DOUGALL, ARE YOU MAKING A
18	GENERAL APPEARANCE TODAY ON BEHALF MR. FOGGO?
19	MR. MAC DOUGALL: YES, YOUR HONOR.
20	THE COURT: MR. GERAGOS, ON BEHALF OF MR. WILKES,
21	ARE YOU MAKING A GENERAL APPEARANCE?
22	MR. GERAGOS: I AM, YOUR HONOR.
23	THE COURT: THE COURT RECOGNIZES, THEN, GENERAL
24	APPEARANCES BY BOTH COUNSEL ON BEHALF OF THESE TWO DEFENDANTS.
25	THE USUAL PROCEDURE IS TO SET A MOTION HEARING AND

TRIAL-SETTING DATE SEVEN WEEKS OUT, BUT I'M WILLING TO BE
INFORMED BY COUNSEL THAT THIS CASE IS UNUSUAL OR DIFFERENT AND
THAT A DIFFERENT DATE SHOULD BE SET.

I SHOULD ASK, MR. HALPERN, CAN YOU TELL ME SOMETHING ABOUT THE COMPLEXITY OF THE CASE AND THE AMOUNT OF DISCOVERY OR HOW SOON IT WILL BE OUT?

MR. HALPERN: YOUR HONOR, DISCOVERY IS READY TO GO,
IN MOST PART, AT THIS POINT. I'VE ALREADY SPOKEN WITH COUNSEL
AND INFORMED THEM THAT THEY SHOULD CONTACT OUR PARALEGAL.
WE'RE PREPARED TO START ROLLING IT OUT THIS WEEK.

IT IS VOLUMINOUS IN TERMS OF THE ACTUAL DOCUMENTS,
MOSTLY BECAUSE THERE'S MUCH EVIDENCE OBTAINED FROM SERVERS.

THESE SERVERS HAVE TERABYTES OF DATA. THAT DOESN'T MEAN THAT
THE AMOUNT OF DATA ON THOSE SERVERS ONCE THEY LOOK AT IT IS
GOING TO BE VOLUMINOUS, BUT AT LEAST IN THE BEGINNING IT IS A
VOLUMINOUS AMOUNT.

WE WILL ATTEMPT TO CATEGORIZE THE INDIVIDUAL DATA
THAT THEY WILL BE EXAMINING SO THAT THEY WILL BE ABLE TO GO TO
THE AREAS WHERE THEY THINK THERE IS DATA THAT MAY BE USEFUL IN
THEIR DEFENSE. WE'LL TRY TO POINT THEM WHENEVER WE CAN TO
THAT SO THEY CAN GET THROUGH THIS IN A QUICK AND EASY FASHION.

FACTUALLY, WE DON'T BELIEVE THE CASE IS PARTICULARLY
COMPLEX IN TERMS OF THE CONTRACTS THAT ARE INVOLVED HERE, AT
LEAST IN TERMS OF WHAT THIS COURT IS USED TO AND WHAT THE
GOVERNMENT PRESENTS IN TERMS OF WHITE COLLAR CASES.

2.4

THE COURT: I'M NOT TRYING TO TRAP YOU WITH THIS

QUESTION BECAUSE I KNOW THIS TERM HAS DIFFERENT MEANINGS TO

DIFFERENT PEOPLE, BUT IS THIS AN OPEN FILE DISCOVERY CASE AS

FAR AS THE GOVERNMENT IS CONCERNED?

MR. HALPERN: WELL, NO. IT WOULDN'T BE AN OPEN FILE DISCOVERY CASE. IN FACT, THERE ARE UNUSUAL DISCOVERY PROBLEMS IN THIS CASE OR ISSUES THAT I THINK MR. BHANDARI IS PREPARED TO ADDRESS AT THIS POINT.

THE COURT: MR. BHANDARI.

MR. BHANDARI: YOUR HONOR, I SUPPOSE WHAT

MR. HALPERN WAS ALLUDING TO WAS THE EXISTENCE OF CLASSIFIED

INFORMATION THAT WOULD BE RELATED TO THE CRIMINAL CONDUCT

HERE. THE PROBLEM IS OBVIOUS. THE DEFENDANT WAS A

HIGH-RANKING OFFICIAL AT THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY. HIS

OVERSEAS LOCATION WHERE HE WAS IS A CLASSIFIED MATTER. SO

CLASSIFIED -- THERE ARE CLASSIFIED INFORMATION PROBLEMS WITH

RESPECT TO A NUMBER OF THE TRANSACTIONS AND EVENTS THAT WE

WILL BE PRESENTING AS PROOF AT TRIAL.

NOW, WE THINK THAT THE TRIAL CAN PROCEED ENTIRELY USING UNCLASSIFIED INFORMATION. BUT SIMPLY BY VIRTUE OF THE CONTEXT IN WHICH THE CRIMINAL ACTIVITY OCCURRED, THERE WILL NEED TO BE A COURT SECURITY OFFICER APPOINTED, IN OUR VIEW. THAT WAS A MOTION WE FILED THIS MORNING FOR YOUR HONOR TO CONSIDER THE NOMINEES THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE HAS SUPPLIED AS COURT SECURITY OFFICERS.

2.4

MR. GERAGOS: I HATE TO BE A FLY IN THE OINTMENT.

I'VE ONLY GOT A BRIEF FAMILIARITY WITH THE INDICTMENT HAVING

PULLED IT UP ON THE UNION-TRIBUNE WEBSITE AND TAKING A LOOK AT

IT YESTERDAY.

IN TAKING A LOOK AT IT, IT LOOKS FAIRLY SIMPLE TO ME. TO SOME DEGREE, I UNDERSTAND FROM THEIR STANDPOINT WHY THEY NEED TO GO THE ROUTE THEY DO.

FROM OUR STANDPOINT, I'VE GOT TWO INDICTMENTS HERE.

THE OTHER ONE APPEARS TO ME -- I DON'T WANT TO GET AHEAD OF

OURSELVES, BUT THE OTHER ONE APPEARS TO ME TO BE ONE THAT'S

UNUSUALLY COMPLEX JUST IN TERMS OF THE SHEER FACTUAL

INVESTIGATION THAT WILL NEED TO BE DONE.

THIS ONE, FROM MY CLIENT'S STANDPOINT, I'VE

SERIOUSLY CONTEMPLATED ASKING THE COURT TO PUT US ON A FAST

TRACK. I THINK WE MIGHT VERY WELL WANT TO TRY THIS CASE

WITHIN THE STATUTORY PERIOD.

THE COURT: WELL, MY USUAL PRACTICE IS TO SET

MOTIONS SEVEN WEEKS OUT IN ALL CASES. WHAT I'LL DO IN THIS

CASE, GIVEN THE REPRESENTATIONS FROM THE UNITED STATES AND

MR. MACDOUGALL'S INCLINATION TO FILE SPECIAL DISCOVERY

MOTIONS, IS SET THE DISCOVERY MOTION OUT SEVEN WEEKS IN THIS

CASE. AND I'LL ENTERTAIN FURTHER ARGUMENT FROM YOU LATER ON

WHEN THE CASE OUGHT TO BE TRIED ON THIS PARTICULAR INDICTMENT.

TISH, IF YOU CAN GIVE ALL COUNSEL A DATE SEVEN WEEKS OUT FOR DISCOVERY, PLEASE.

9 THE CLERK: APRIL 2ND AT 2:00. 1 2 THE COURT: IS THAT A CONVENIENT DATE AND TIME FOR 3 COUNSEL, APRIL 2ND, 2:00? 4 MR. GERAGOS: YES. 5 MR. MACDOUGALL: YES, YOUR HONOR. 6 THE COURT: NOW, LET ME TURN TO THE CONDITIONS OF 7 RELEASE. 8 MR. HALPERN, MR. FORGE, MR. BHANDARI, DOES THE 9 GOVERNMENT HAVE A POSITION REGARDING CONDITIONS OF RELEASE AS 10 TO MR. WILKES? 11 MR. HALPERN: WE DO. I'VE DISCUSSED IT WITH THE 12 DEFENSE COUNSEL. WE BELIEVE THAT A \$2 MILLION BOND WOULD BE 13 ADEQUATE IN THIS CASE. IT WOULD BE SECURED BY REAL PROPERTY. I BELIEVE THAT THE REAL PROPERTY CONSISTS OF THE DEFENDANT'S 14 HOUSE AS WELL AS THE HOUSES OF TWO OF HIS BROTHERS. 15 16 EQUITY IN THOSE HOUSES WOULD APPROACH THAT 1.5 MILLION. 17 REST COULD BE SECURED ON BOND. WE DO ALSO BELIEVE HE SHOULD 18 RELINQUISH HIS PASSPORT, AND THE COURT SHOULD LOOK INTO THE 19 OTHER NORMAL CONDITIONS. 20 THE COURT: MR. GERAGOS, IS THAT AN AGREEMENT 21 BETWEEN THE PARTIES? 22 MR. GERAGOS: THAT IS. MR. HALPERN AND I WORKED ON 23 THAT THIS MORNING. 24 THE COURT: MR. WILKES, THE COURT SETS ON THIS CASE 25 THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS OF RELEASE: YOU'RE TO POST A SURETY

1	BOND SECURED BY PROPERTY IN THE AMOUNT OF \$2 MILLION.	
2	DO YOU HAVE AN ACTIVE PASSPORT?	
3	DEFENDANT WILKES: NO.	
4	THE COURT: YOU'RE NOT TO LEAVE THE UNITED STATES.	
5	THERE'S NO REASON WHY HE CAN'T BE FREE TO TRAVEL IN	
6	THE UNITED STATES, IS THERE?	
7	MR. HALPERN: ABSOLUTELY NOT.	
8	THE COURT: TRAVEL IS RESTRICTED TO WITHIN THE	
9	UNITED STATES.	
10	YOU'RE NOT TO VIOLATE ANY LAWS. I CAN'T THINK OF	
11	ANY OTHER CONDITIONS I WOULD SET IN THIS CASE UNLESS YOU HAVE	
12	SOME SUGGESTIONS.	
13	MR. HALPERN: YES, YOUR HONOR, THERE IS ONE, WHICH	
14	IS SLIGHTLY UNUSUAL. MR. GERAGOS AND I DISCUSSED IT.	
15	THE ARRIVAL AT A BONDING AMOUNT WAS SOMEWHAT	
16	DIFFICULT FOR THE GOVERNMENT. OBVIOUSLY, HE HAS LONG TIES TO	
17	THE COMMUNITY HERE. HE'S KNOWN ABOUT THE CHARGES. ALL OF	
18	THESE THINGS CERTAINLY AUGER HIS APPEARANCE IN COURT TODAY.	
19	WE ALLOWED SELF-SURRENDER WITH THAT IN MIND.	
20	ON THE OTHER HAND, HIS FINANCIAL CONDITION AS TO	
21	WHAT WE READ IN THE NEWSPAPERS AS WELL AS FROM LOOKING AT ALL	
22	THE DOCUMENTS WE'VE ASSEMBLED IS CERTAINLY ONE THAT DOESN'T	
23	SUGGEST THAT HE HAS A LOT OF FINANCIAL TIES TO THE COMMUNITY.	
24	THE ONE THING THAT CONCERNED THE GOVERNMENT WAS WHEN	
25	WE WERE LOOKING AT HIS FINANCIAL RECORDS, WE NOTICED THAT	

2.4

THERE WERE A NUMBER OF FOREIGN BANK ACCOUNTS. I SPOKE TO

MR. GERAGOS ABOUT THIS. SOME OF THESE BANK ACCOUNTS, AT LEAST

ONE OF THEM, WAS USED, IN OUR OPINION, IN THE BRIBERY SCHEME.

AND THEREFORE, IT WAS VERY IMPORTANT TO DETERMINE WHAT ASSETS

WERE IN THE FOREIGN BANK ACCOUNTS.

MR. GERAGOS HAS REPRESENTED, AND I TAKE HIM AT HIS WORD, THAT MR. WILKES WILL PROVIDE THE GOVERNMENT AND THE COURT SOME STATEMENTS FOR THE LAST SEVERAL MONTHS FROM THESE BANK ACCOUNTS AND CERTIFY THAT THESE ARE ALL THE BANK ACCOUNTS HE HAS AND THESE ARE, IN FACT, THE ASSETS IN THIS BANK ACCOUNT. WITH THAT IN MIND, I DO THINK THAT THE BAIL IS APPROPRIATE.

THE ONE OTHER MATTER HAS TO DO WITH THE SALE OF HIS CORPORATE HEADQUARTERS. IT WOULD APPEAR -- THIS IS SOMETHING THAT THE GOVERNMENT IS IN FAVOR OF -- THERE ARE MANY, MANY DEBTORS THAT ARE INTERESTED IN SEEING THE RESULTS OF THAT SALE. THE GOVERNMENT CERTAINLY DOESN'T WANT TO INTERFERE WITH THAT. IT'S IMPORTANT THAT WHOEVER IS OWED MONEY GETS MONEY AND WE DO NOTHING TO INTERFERE WITH THE SALE. SO I DON'T WANT TO ENCUMBER THE SALE IN ANY WAY.

BUT IF, IN FACT, THE SALE IS, I BELIEVE, OVER \$12 MILLION OR \$15 MILLION I THINK IT IS, THERE WILL BE ADDITIONAL ASSETS THAT MR. WILKES WILL RECEIVE. AND IT COULD BE AS MUCH AS \$3 MILLION. IF THAT DOES OCCUR, I THINK THAT THE COURT SHOULD, IN FACT -- WE SHOULD REVISIT THE

APPROPRIATENESS OF THE BOND SO HE NOT BE ALLOWED TO SIMPLY
HAVE THOSE ASSETS UNENCUMBERED IN ANY WAY.

THE COURT: MR. WILKES, HOW LONG HAVE YOU LIVED IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY?

DEFENDANT WILKES: ALL MY LIFE.

THE COURT: MR. GERAGOS, ARE YOU IN AGREEMENT TO PROVIDE A CERTIFIED STATEMENT REGARDING THE AMOUNTS IN THE OVERSEAS BANK ACCOUNTS WITHIN THREE WEEKS?

MR. GERAGOS: WHAT I SUGGESTED TO MR. HALPERN IS
THERE'S ONE ACCOUNT THAT PIQUED THEIR INTEREST. IT'S BEEN
CLOSED FOR FIVE YEARS. I WILL GIVE A CERTIFIED STATEMENT AS
TO THAT. I ALSO BROUGHT TO HIS ATTENTION THAT THERE IS ONE
OTHER ACCOUNT. I'M TOLD IT'S GOT \$250 IN IT AND THAT HE
REPORTS IT ON HIS TAX RETURN. I'LL SUPPLY A COPY OF THAT
SCHEDULE AND ALSO INCLUDE THAT CERTIFICATION WITHIN THREE
WEEKS.

THE COURT: THE COURT ORDERS THAT AS AN ADDITIONAL CONDITION. I'M NOT INCLINED TO DO ANYTHING ABOUT THE SALE OF THE BUSINESS. I THINK THAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN IN ORDINARY COURSE. I THINK \$2 MILLION IS SUFFICIENT BOND FOR A FELLOW WHO'S BEEN HERE HIS ENTIRE LIFE. SO I'LL LEAVE IT AT THAT.

MR. WILKES, LET ME REMIND YOU, I DON'T KNOW WHETHER
YOU'VE GOT FIREARMS IN THE HOUSE. IT'S A VIOLATION OF FEDERAL
LAW TO POSSESS A FIREARM OR AMMUNITION IF YOU'RE UNDER
INDICTMENT ON A FEDERAL CRIME. IF THAT'S THE CASE, FIREARMS

2.4

1	HAVE TO GO OUT. GIVE THEM TO SOMEBODY ELSE. GIVE THEM TO
2	YOUR LAWYER. YOU SHOULD NOT BE IN POSSESSION OF ANY FIREARMS.
3	THOSE ARE THE CONDITIONS OF RELEASE AS TO
4	MR. WILKES.
5	AS TO MR. FOGGO?
6	MR. BHANDARI: YES, YOUR HONOR.
7	WE'VE REACHED AN AGREEMENT TO THE BOND FOR
8	MR. FOGGO. IT WOULD BE A \$200,000 BOND SECURED UP TO \$100,000
9	BY SIGNATURES OF TWO OTHER FINANCIALLY RESPONSIBLE ADULTS.
10	AGAIN, WE DON'T ANTICIPATE ANY NEED TO RESTRICT TRAVEL WITHIN
11	THE UNITED STATES. ANY INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL WILL BE UP TO
12	PRE-TRIAL SERVICES.
13	THE ONLY SPECIAL CONDITION WITH RESPECT TO MR. FOGGO
14	WE WOULD ASK IS THAT ANY DISSEMINATION OF CLASSIFIED
15	INFORMATION BE ON COUNSEL. COUNSEL HAS BEEN PREVIOUSLY
16	CLEARED BY THE CIA TO RECEIVE CLASSIFIED INFORMATION AND WILL
17	KEEP IT IN ACCORDANCE WITH APPROPRIATE PROCEDURES. ANY
18	DISSEMINATION BEYOND THAT MUST BE IN CONCURRENCE WITH THE
19	COURT SECURITY OFFICE.
20	THE COURT: IS HE CURRENTLY EMPLOYED BY THE UNITED
21	STATES GOVERNMENT, MR. FOGGO?
22	MR. MACDOUGALL: NO, YOUR HONOR. MR. FOGGO RETIRED
23	IN AUGUST.
24	THE COURT: SO I'M NOT CLEAR ON THE
25	HOW WOULD HE DISSEMINATE CLASSIFIED INFORMATION IF

HE'S NO LONGER EMPLOYED?

MR. BHANDARI: YOUR HONOR, BY VIRTUE OF HIS POSITION, WHAT HE WAS DOING, IT'S IN HIS HEAD.

MR. MACDOUGALL: THAT'S CORRECT. WHAT MR. BHANDARI IS ASKING FOR IS THE PRACTICE THAT MR. FOGGO HAS OBSERVED ALL OF HIS CAREER IN THE C.I.A. SO HE'S NOT ASKING FOR ANYTHING BEYOND WHAT MR. FOGGO HAS DONE AND, IN FACT, WHAT HE'S DONE WITH US.

THE COURT: MR. FOGGO, DO YOU HAVE ANY INTENTION TO TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE COUNTRY?

DEFENDANT FOGGO: I HAVE NO INTENTION OF TRAVELING
OUTSIDE THE COUNTRY. I DO HAVE RELATIVES OUTSIDE. IN THE
EVENT OF A DEATH OR SOMETHING, I WOULD APPROACH -- I TRAVELED
LAST SUMMER AND LET COUNSEL KNOW SO THERE WAS NO UNEASE
ABOUT.

THE COURT: THE COURT SETS THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS FOR MR. FOGGO'S RELEASE: HE'S TO POST A PERSONAL SURETY BOND IN THE AMOUNT OF \$200,000 SECURED TO THE AMOUNT OF \$100,000 BY THE SIGNATURES OF TWO FINANCIALLY RESPONSIBLE PEOPLE. YOU'RE TO SIGN THE BOND, TOO, MR. FOGGO, ON YOUR OWN BEHALF.

TRAVEL WILL BE RESTRICTED TO THE UNITED STATES. IF SOMETHING COMES UP, MR. MACDOUGALL, YOU CAN PETITION THE COURT FOR SOME DEVIATION FROM THE TRAVEL RESTRICTION.

MR. FOGGO, DO WHAT YOU'VE ALWAYS DONE AND KEEP STATE SECRETS TO YOURSELF. YOU'RE NOT TO DISSEMINATE THAT

AS A CONDITION OF PRE-TRIAL RELEASE CONSISTENT WITH THE

CONDITIONS THAT I IMPOSED. IF SOMETHING COMES UP AS YOU

HYPOTHESIZED, LIKE A DEATH IN THE FAMILY, THEN I WOULD

CERTAINLY ALLOW YOU TO GO ATTEND TO THAT. BUT FOR THE TIME

BEING, YOU'RE TO SURRENDER YOUR PASSPORT.

ALL RIGHT. I'LL SEE YOU BACK, MR. FOGGO, ON

APRIL 2ND AT 2:00, AT WHICH TIME WE'LL TAKE UP DISCOVERY

MOTIONS.

ONE LAST THING.

MR. HALPERN, I NOTICED THAT RELATED CASE NOTICES WERE FILED IN BOTH OF THESE CASES.

CAN YOU ARTICULATE FOR ME HOW THIS CASE IS RELATED?

I'M ASSIGNED THIS CASE BECAUSE I WAS ASSIGNED CONGRESSMAN

CUNNINGHAM'S CASE. I UNDERSTAND THE RELATIONSHIP HAVING READ

THE INDICTMENT IN THE FIRST CASE. I THINK I UNDERSTAND THE

RELATIONSHIP HERE, BUT I ALSO WOULD LIKE YOU TO HUM A FEW BARS

ABOUT WHY THIS CASE IS RELATED TO THE EARLIER CASE.

MR. HALPERN: CERTAINLY, YOUR HONOR.

AS YOU KNOW, BOTH OF THESE CASES STEM FROM THE SAME INVESTIGATION. AND IN DOING SO, THERE IS A VAST OVERLAP, ESPECIALLY IN THE AMOUNT OF DISCOVERY, BUT AS WELL IN THE WITNESSES THAT THE COURT WILL DEAL WITH AS WELL AS THE FACTUAL SETTING HERE.

MR. WADE WAS ONE OF THE CO-CONSPIRATORS IN THE INITIAL CUNNINGHAM-RELATED INDICTMENT. IN FACT, WORKED FOR

MR. WILKES FOR A LONG PERIOD OF TIME BRINGING HIM INTO THE CONSPIRACY AS WELL AS ONE OF THE MAJOR WITNESSES THAT WILL HAVE TO APPEAR.

THAT IS SIMILAR TO A NUMBER OF OTHER WITNESSES WHICH HAVE BEEN EMPLOYED BY MR. WILKES THAT ARE GOING TO BE ASKED TO TESTIFY IF, IN FACT, THIS CASE GOES TO TRIAL, IN BOTH OF THE TRIALS.

THE COURT: YOU'RE TELLING ME THAT THE EVIDENCE AND
THE WITNESSES ON THE CASE I'VE JUST ARRAIGNED MR. FOGGO AND
MR. WILKES ON IS GOING TO OVERLAP WITH THE WILKES/HOWARD CASE?

MR. HALPERN: WILKES/MICHAEL, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: I'M SORRY. TELL ME AGAIN, MR. HALPERN.

MR. HALPERN: WILKES/MICHAEL.

THE ANSWER TO YOUR QUESTION IS SIMPLY YES. AS WE GO
THROUGH THE TRIAL, YOU'RE GOING TO SEE WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO
DEAL WITH SOME OF THE SIMILAR LEGAL ISSUES. IN PARTICULAR,
STARTING AT THE NEXT HEARING, DISCOVERY OVERLAPS, I WOULD SAY,
70 PERCENT BETWEEN THE TWO CASES.

THE COURT: IS THERE A REASON THAT THE CHARGES WERE

NOT CONSOLIDATED IN A SINGLE INDICTMENT THAT I SHOULD KNOW

NOW, OR IS IT SOMETHING THAT YOU WANT TO ADDRESS IN THE PAPERS

LATER?

MR. HALPERN: NO, YOUR HONOR. IT WAS SIMPLY OUR BELIEF THAT AT THE END OF THE DAY, MR. FOGGO CLEARLY WOULD HAVE WANTED SEVERANCE AND MR. MICHAEL WOULD HAVE WANTED A

2.4

	10
1	SEVERANCE. THIS IS SOMETHING THAT THE COURT I KNOW CONCERNS
2	ITSELF WITH ON A DAILY BASIS.
3	AND IT IS OUR OPINION THAT IF WE WENT DOWN THAT
4	ROAD, THE COURT WOULD BE FACED WITH AN ISSUE OF PROTECTING THE
5	RIGHTS OF THOSE INDIVIDUALS TO A FAIR TRIAL AND WOULD LIKELY
6	HAVE SEVERED THE CASE RATHER THAN HAVE THAT HAPPEN TO THE CASE
7	THE LAST MINUTE, BECAUSE IT'S BETTER TO HAVE THE CASE PROCEED
8	ALONG SEPARATE TRACKS SO THE COURT CAN CONTROL EACH ONE
9	INDIVIDUALLY.
10	THE COURT: MR. MACDOUGALL, MR. GERAGOS, DO YOU HAVE
11	ANY POSITION REGARDING THE NOTICE OF RELATED CASE ON THE
12	CUNNINGHAM MATTER?
13	MR. GERAGOS: WE DO NOT.
14	MR. MACDOUGALL: WITHOUT WAIVING THE RIGHT TO FILE A
15	MOTION FOR SEVERANCE DOWN THE ROAD, NOT AT THE MOMENT.
16	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU, GENTLEMEN.
17	MR. FOGGO, YOU'RE EXCUSED. YOU NEED TO GO TO THE
18	MARSHAL'S OFFICE BEFORE YOU LEAVE THE BUILDING.
19	000
20	I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE TESTIMONY
21	ADDUCED IN THE FOREGOING MATTER IS
22	A TRUE RECORD OF SAID PROCEEDINGS.
23	S/ EVA OEMICK 1-30-09
24	EVA OEMICK OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER DATE
25	